Adams et al. U.S.S.N. 09/780,989 Page 5

It is believed the new claims presented herein render the rejections moot. For instance, the new claims do not recite "reactive to crosslinking". The dependency of the claims also is correct. In view thereof, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are requested.

Claims 1-5, 7-8, 10-19 and 21-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Takeda et al. (U.S. Patent 6,156,481) with Sato (U.S. Patent 5,817,444) cited to show alleged inherent properties.

Claims 1-8 and 10-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) over Shimada et al. (U.S. Patent 6.033,828) with Sato (U.S. Patent 5,817,444) cited to show alleged inherent properties.

Claims 1-7, 9-11, 15-16 and 21-25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 over Winkle (U.S. Patent 5,650,261).

For the sake of brevity, the three Section 102 rejections are addressed in combination.

The pending claims call for photoresist compositions that comprise a polymer that is substantially free of aromatic groups. That subject matter was not rejected over Takeda et al. (U.S. Patent 6,156,481) or Shimada et al. (U.S. Patent 6,033,828). See original claim 9.

The pending claims also call for a polymer that comprises photoacid-labile groups. The Winkle document does not report such photoacid-labile groups.

In view thereof, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are requested. See, for instance, *In re Marshall*, 198 USPQ 344, 346 (CCPA 1978) ("[r]ejections under 35 U.S.C. §102 are proper only when the claimed subject matter is identically disclosed or described in the prior art.")

Adams et al. U.S.S.N. 09/780,989 Page 6

It is believed the application is in condition for immediate allowance, which action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Peter F. Coriess (Reg. 33,860) EDWARDS & ANGELL, LLP

Dike, Bronstein, Roberts & Cushman IP Group

P.O. Box 9169

Boston, MA 02209

(617) 439-4444